1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT TACOMA	
10	RICHARD WESLEY BRYAN,	
11	Petitioner,	CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05092-RBL-JRC
12	v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
13	PATRICK GLEBE,	
14	Respondent.	
15	This case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura	
16	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4.	
17	On February 8, 2016, petitioner Richard Wesley Bryan filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition,	
18	in which he seeks to challenge his conviction for refusing to submit a urinalysis or urine sample.	
19	Dkt. 4 at 1. Because it appears that the petition may be a second or successive petition, which	
20	must be transferred to the Ninth Circuit, petitioner is ordered to show cause on or before March	
21	11, 2016 why his petition should not be transferred.	
22	In his current petition, petitioner states that he seeks to challenge the decision of the	
23	Washington Court of Appeals (COA No. 46055-6-II) and Washington Supreme Court (No.	
24		

91161-4). Dkt. 4 at 1. However, petitioner does not specifically state what conviction he is 2 challenging nor does he give the date of his conviction. Petitioner attaches both state court decisions to his petition. The Washington Court of Appeals dismissed petitioner's personal 3 restraint petition challenging a Department of Corrections' determination that petitioner had 5 failed to submit a sample for urinalysis testing as successive. Dkt. 4 at 17. The Washington 6 Supreme Court denied review of petitioner's personal restraint petition. Dkt. 4 at 20. 7 Petitioner has previously sought habeas relief in this Court as to his 2012 disciplinary 8 hearing in which petitioner failed to provide a urine sample. Bryan v. Glebe, Case No. 13-5828-BHS/KLS. Case No. 13-5828 was denied and a certificate of appealability was denied. Dkts. 14, 10 16. Petitioner also attaches a copy of the Order Adopting Report and Recommendation in Case 11 No. 13-5828 to his petition. Dkt. 4 at 26. 12 Petitioner has also sought habeas relief in his Court related to his 2006 conviction of first degree child molestation, first degree burglary, and first degree rape. Bryan v. Glebe, Case No. 13 14 14-5147-BHS/KLS. Case No. 14-5147 is currently pending. See Dkt. 26. 15 Petitioner acknowledges that a prior habeas case was dismissed because he failed to exhaust his state court remedies, but claims that he now retains a powerful and legitimate interest 16 17 in obtaining habeas review because he is in fact innocent. Dkt. 4 at 13. It is unclear whether petitioner refers to Case No. 13-5828-BHS/KLS, Case No. 14-5147-BHS/KLS or another case. 18 19 Because petitioner does not include the conviction he is challenging in his petition, nor 20 does he give the date of his conviction, it is unclear if petitioner's current petition is a second or 21 successive petition. If a petition is second or successive, then petitioner must seek authorization 22 from the Court of Appeals before filing the new petition with the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 2244 23 (b) (3) (A). Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3 (a) provides guidance:

24

Any petitioner seeking leave to file a second or successive 2254 petition or 2255 motion in district court must seek leave under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244 or 2255. An original and five copies of the application must be filed with the Clerk of the Court of Appeals. No filing fee is required. If a second or successive petition or motion, or application for leave to file such a petition or motion, is mistakenly submitted to the district court, the district court shall refer it to the court of appeals. Accordingly, petitioner is ordered to show cause why his petition is not successive and should not be transferred on or before March 11, 2016. Failure to show cause shall be deemed a failure to properly prosecute this matter and the Court will recommend dismissal of this matter. Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016. J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge